



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Advances in Research
Manuscript Number:	2014_AIR_9161
Title of the Manuscript:	Environmentally Favourable and Unfavorable Bacteria
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The manuscript "Environmentally Favourable and Unfavorable Bacteria" is not written well. First of all, english used is not proper. Many sentences are not conveying proper meaning. There is lack of flow in the contents. The author(s) should give a good discussions than just merely writing the results obtained by the researchers in the referenced manuscripts. The section 2, saprophytic bacteria is not described well and the examples given are not at all correct. In the section 5, Antibacterial lectins, the author(s) has given the results of various researches carried out throughout the works but are not discussed properly. The author(s) have used several non-standard abbreviations whose full forms are not described anywhere in the manuscript. The conclusion is not written well. The author(s) have attempted to give a brief each about the three classes of bacteria namely saprophytic, symbiotic and parasitic bacteria, and also about Antibacterial lectins and the title does not correctly suit it, though they have attempted to give a few examples for the role of bacteria in the environment.</p> <p>Few other corrections that need to be made:</p> <p>Line 9-10 – Reframe the sentence</p> <p>Line 12-13 does not convey the meaning properly</p> <p>Line 16 – use a more appropriate word for 'chapter'</p> <p>Line 31 - Reframe the sentence</p> <p>Line 35 - Give proper reference for the sentence</p> <p>Line 38 – Remove 'a' from the sentence</p> <p>Line 39 - Reframe the sentence</p> <p>Line 41 – Replace 'and' with 'are'</p> <p>Line 61 - Reframe the sentence</p> <p>Figure 2: Correct the spelling for nitrifying and denitrifying bacteria</p>	



SDI Review Form 1.6

	<p>Line 154 – Reframe the sentence to give its clear meaning</p> <p>Line 162 – Reframe the sentence to give its clear meaning</p> <p>Line 172 – Reframe the complete sentence to give its clear meaning</p> <p>Line 172 – Figure 3 does not show relevance to the description in this line</p> <p>Line 180-181 – Give proper reference and give suitable examples</p> <p>Line 195 – Sentence is ended without complete it</p> <p>Line 200 – Reframe the sentence</p> <p>Line 204 – Give suitable examples and also add proper reference</p> <p>Line 227 – Remove ‘in’ which is adjacent to plants</p> <p>Line 232 – Use more appropriate word for ‘in damage’</p> <p>Figure 4 – Not relevant</p> <p>Line 261 - Reframe the sentence to give its clear meaning</p> <p>Line 292 – Give reference</p> <p>Line 377 – Replace ‘to’ with ‘for’</p> <p>Line 381 – Give a suitable example for Simuliidae family</p>	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	-	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	<p>Environmentally Favourable and Unfavourable bacteria becomes a broader title and hence one can find more relevant research articles which can help the authors to give more suitable and better discussions. There is no novelty and also the manuscript is not written well. English is also not correct. And hence the manuscript in its current form cannot be accepted for publishing. It needs a massive revision for considering for publishing.</p>	

Note: Anonymous Reviewer